



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/777,310

02/12/2004

Keith B. Gorden

58232US004

5538

32692 7590 08/23/2007  
3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY  
PO BOX 33427  
ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427

EXAMINER

ROBINSON, HOPE A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1652

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/23/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/777,310

Applicant(s)

GORDEN ET AL.

Examiner

Hope A. Robinson

Art Unit

1652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5/24/07.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21 and 30-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21 and 30-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 1652

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Application Status***

1. The Art Unit location of your application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 1652.
2. Applicant's response to the Office Action mailed March 7, 2007 on May 24, 2007 is acknowledged.

### ***Claim Disposition***

3. Claims 21 and 30-44 are pending and are under examination.

### ***Maintained-Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 21 and 30-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably

Art Unit: 1652

convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claimed invention is directed to a pharmaceutical composition comprising a TLR8 agonist in combination with a carrier. The claim is not clearly defined by any structural limitations. It is noted that claim 21 recites a laundry list of compounds, however, there is no indication in the claim as to how each compound associates with each other or are connected via chemical bonds for example. It is also noted that applicants amended the claims to identify a aminopyridine fused to a 5-membered nitrogen containing ring, however, no nexus is made between that structure and the laundry list of compounds and their derivatives. It is noted that claims 30-44 recites one TLR8 agonist from the listing in claim 21, however, this does not rectify the deficiency in providing a nexus between one compound and the next. In addition, the recited compounds in claims 30-44 could have any amounts of substituents attached to the compound. In addition, claim 21 is directed to several derivatives, which are not adequately described. A skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the agonist as claimed. In addition, the claim encompasses a genus of agonist. The instant specification fails to provide a representative number of species for the claimed genus. A representative number of species means that the species, which are adequately described, are representative of the entire genus. Thus the claims lack adequate written description to demonstrate to a skilled artisan that applicant was in possession of the claimed invention. An applicant shows possession of the claimed invention by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations using such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, and formulas that fully set forth the claimed invention. See *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d

Art Unit: 1652

1961, 1966 (*Fed. Cir. 1997*). Therefore, a biomolecule sequence described only by a functional characteristic, without any known or disclosed correlation between that function and the structure of the sequence, normally is not a sufficient identifying characteristic for written description purposes, even when accompanied by a method of obtaining the claimed sequence. For example, even though a genetic code table would correlate a known amino acid sequence with a genus of coding nucleic acids, the same table cannot predict the native, naturally occurring nucleic acid sequence of a naturally occurring mRNA or its corresponding cDNA. See *MPEP 2163*.

Further, *Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-64, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1117 (*Fed. Cir. 1991*), states that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in *possession of the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*" (See page 1117). The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed" (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116). The skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed genus of encoded proteins, and therefore, conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method of isolating it. The compound itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601 at 1606 (*CAFC 1993*). See *MPEP 2163*.

Art Unit: 1652

Therefore, for all these reasons the specification lacks adequate written description, and one of skill in the art cannot reasonably conclude that the applicant had possession of the claimed invention at the time the instant application was filed.

5. Claims 21 and 30-44 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a specific TLR8 agonist, does not reasonably provide enablement for any or all TLR8 agonist and any amounts of substituents added to said compounds or any derivatives thereof for the structures set forth in claim 21. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The enablement requirement refers to the requirement that the specification describe how to make and how to use the invention. There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is undue. These factors include, but are not limited to: Quantity of Experimentation Necessary; Amount of direction or guidance presented; Presence or absence of working examples; Nature of the Invention; State of the prior art and Relative skill of those in the art; Predictability or unpredictability of the art and Breadth of the claims (see *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988)). The factors most relevant to the instant invention are discussed below.

The amount of experimentation required to practice the claimed invention is undue as the claims encompass an unspecified amount of agonist that can comprise any amounts of substituents attached to the structure. Further, the claims do not provide a structure *per se*, as

Art Unit: 1652

there is no indication in the claims how each compound is associated with each other, for example how are they bonded to each other. For example, the specification indicates that the TLR8 agonist can be a tetrahydromimidazoquinoline amine, however, said agonist could comprise substituents attached for which no guidance is provided. It is noted that applicants amended the claims to identify a aminopyridine fused to a 5-membered nitrogen containing ring, however, no nexus is made between that structure and the laundry list of compounds and their derivatives. In addition, claim 21 is directed to a genus of derivatives for which no guidance is provided. A skilled artisan would have to engage in undue experimentation to first determine if a protein is of the TLR8 family and then test to see if it has the desired activity.

The skilled artisan would recognize the high degree of unpredictability that all proteins belonging to the TLR8 family would be an agonist or that all agonist of the TLR8 family of proteins would function as desired in the pharmaceutical composition. The specification lacks adequate guidance/direction to enable a skilled artisan to practice the claimed invention commensurate in scope with the claims. The specification does not provide support for the broad scope of the claim, which encompasses an unspecified amount of agonist. The issue in this case is the breath of the claims in light of the predictability of the art as determined by the number of working examples, the skill level artisan and the guidance presented in the instant specification and the prior art of record. This make and test position is inconsistent with the decisions of *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970) where it is stated that "...scope of claims must bear a reasonable correlation to scope of enablement provided by the specification to persons of ordinary skill in the art...". Without sufficient guidance, determination of having the desired biological characteristics is unpredictable and the experimentation left to those skilled in

Art Unit: 1652

the art is unnecessarily and improperly extensive and undue. See *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Thus, for all these reasons, the specification is not considered to be enabling for one skilled in the art to make and use the claimed invention as the amount of experimentation required is undue. Therefore, the claimed invention cannot be practiced in a manner that reasonably correlates with the scope of the claims, to be considered enabling.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 21 and 30-44 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter, which applicant (s) regard as their invention.

Claim 21 and the dependent claims hereto are indefinite for the recitation of a laundry list of compounds as it is unclear how the compounds are associated. No nexus is provided between the recited compounds to give a clear picture of a structure, for example is the substituted imidazoquinoline amine attached to the tetrahydroimidazoquinoline?

#### ***Maintained-Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –



Art Unit: 1652

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 21 and 30 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Richardson (J. of Org. Chem., vol. 25, page 1138, 1963), based on the recognition in the art water is a carrier.

Richardson teaches substituted imidazoquinoline amines. Claims 21 and 30 are anticipated as the structure of the compound is disclosed by the reference, thus would inherently be a "Toll-like receptor agonist". In addition, the claims recite the open language "comprises" which indicates that other structures can be present, and also the claims do not indicate a connection or association between the listing of compounds recited in for example claim 21. Thus, the limitations of the claims are met by the reference.

***Withdrawn-Basis For NonStatutory Double Patenting***

9. Previous rejection for Obvious-type double Patenting is withdrawn based on the amendment submitted.

***Response to Applicant's Arguments:***

10. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, however the rejections of record remain for the reasons stated above and herein. With regard to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102, applicants state that the claims have been amended to recite a "2-aminopyridine structure" not taught by the reference. However, the instant specification

Art Unit: 1652

discloses that "IRM compounds suitable for use as TLR8 agonists include compounds having a 2-aminopyridine fused to a five membered nitrogen-containing heterocyclic ring. Such compounds include, for example, imidazoquinoline amines including but not limited to substituted imidazoquinoline amines such as, for example, amide substituted imidazoquinoline amines, sulfonamide substituted imidazoquinoline amines, urea substituted imidazoquinoline amines, aryl ether substituted imidazoquinoline amines, heterocyclic ether substituted imidazoquinoline amines, amido ether substituted imidazoquinoline amines, sulfonamido ether substituted imidazoquinoline amines, urea substituted imidazoquinoline ethers, thioether substituted imidazoquinoline amines, and 6-, 7-, 8-, or 9-aryl or heteroaryl substituted imidazoquinoline amines; tetrahydroimidazoquinoline amines including but not limited to amide substituted tetrahydroimidazoquinoline amines, sulfonamide substituted tetrahydroimidazoquinoline amines, urea substituted tetrahydroimidazoquinoline amines, aryl ether substituted tetrahydroimidazoquinoline amines, heterocyclic ether substituted tetrahydroimidazoquinoline amines, amido ether substituted tetrahydroimidazoquinoline amines, sulfonamido ether substituted tetrahydroimidazoquinoline amines, urea substituted tetrahydroimidazoquinoline ethers, and thioether substituted tetrahydroimidazoquinoline amines; imidazopyridine amines including but not limited to amide substituted imidazopyridine amines, sulfonamide substituted imidazopyridine amines, urea substituted imidazopyridine amines, aryl ether substituted imidazopyridine amines, heterocyclic ether substituted imidazopyridine amines, amido ether substituted imidazopyridine amines, sulfonamido ether substituted imidazopyridine amines, urea substituted imidazopyridine ethers, and thioether substituted imidazopyridine amines; 1,2-bridged imidazoquinoline amines; 6,7-fused cycloalkylimidazopyridine amines; imidazonaphthyridine amines; tetrahydroimidazonaphthyridine amines; oxazoloquinoline amines; thiazoloquinoline amines; oxazolopyridine amines; thiazolopyridine amines; oxazonaphthyridine amines; thiazolonaphthyridine amines; and 1H-imidazo dimers fused to pyridine amines, quinoline amines, tetrahydroquinoline amines, naphthyridine amines, or tetrahydronaphthyridine amines".

Therefore the disclosure provides several compounds to exemplify the recited 2-aminopyridine fused to a five membered nitrogen-containing heterocyclic ring, several of which are disclosed by the reference. Further the reference teaches 2-amino derivatives and imidazoquinoline amines (see page 2581 of the Richardson reference), therefore the reference remains relevant.

With regard to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraphs, applicants that the rejection should be withdrawn in view of the amendment to insert the language a 2-aminopyridine fused to a five membered nitrogen-containing heterocyclic ring. This argument is not persuasive because the claims are directed to TLR-8 composition comprising the 2-aminopyridine fused to a 5-membered nitrogen containing heterocyclic ring with a laundry list of compounds, which gives a skilled artisan a vague glimpse of what the structure of the protein will look like. In addition, the claims are directed to derivatives of the compounds. The claims do not set forth where on the structure these compounds will be attached or what the derivatives look like. Further, the rejection under 35U.S.C. 112, second paragraph remains. Applicant indicates that a skilled artisan would recognize the structure, however this argument is not persuasive because a skilled artisan could recognize a 2-aminopyridine fused to a five membered nitrogen-containing heterocyclic ring, however would need guidance as to where for example the "sulfonamide substituted imidazopyridine amines, urea substituted imidazopyridine amines, aryl ether substituted imidazopyridine amines, heterocyclic ether substituted imidazopyridine amines, amido ether substituted imidazopyridine amines, sulfonamido ether substituted imidazopyridine amines, urea substituted imidazopyridine ethers, and thioether substituted imidazopyridine amines; 1,2-bridged imidazoquinoline amines; 6,7-fused cycloalkylimidazopyridine amines; imidazonaphthyridine amines; tetrahydroimidazonaphthyridine amines; oxazoloquinoline amines; thiazoloquinoline amines; oxazolopyridine amines; thiazolopyridine amines; oxazolnaphthyridine amines; thiazolonaphthyridine amines; and 1H-imidazo dimers fused to pyridine amines,

Art Unit: 1652

quinoline amines, tetrahydroquinoline amines, naphthyridine amines, or tetrahydronaphthyridine amines" get attached. Thus the rejection remains.

### *Conclusion*

11. No claims are allowable.

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new/modified ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1652

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hope A. Robinson whose telephone number is 571-272-0957. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ponnathapu Achutamurthy, can be reached at (571) 272-0928. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hope Robinson, MS

Primary Examiner

*HR*  
*8/20/07*

HOPE ROBINSON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER